



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,401	07/01/2003	Ye-Kui Wang	088245-0152	3233
23524	7590	12/27/2007	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 150 EAST GILMAN STREET P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI 53701-1497			DUONG, CHRISTINE T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2616		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		12/27/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	10/612,401	Applicant(s)	WANG ET AL.
Examiner	Christine Duong	Art Unit	2616

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5-7,9-11,15-20,24-28 and 30-32.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Based on the Final Action, the newly amended and previously presented claims do not place the present application in condition for allowance. The amended claims do not change the previous rejection and since the limitations have already been addressed, the examiner maintains the claim rejections as previously described in the Final Action.

In addition, Applicant's arguments filed on 10 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 18, 20, 24-26 that Matsui fails to teach, suggest, or disclose "sending a response to the received first request from the streaming server to the streaming client, the response including a plurality of error resilience levels supportable by the streaming server in sending the media to the streaming client, wherein the plurality of error resilience levels includes a default error resilience level and an alternative error resilience level", the examiner respectfully disagrees. The user of the client terminal selects a default value. The server sends a plurality of error resilience levels. The user receives the plurality of error resilience levels and based on the default value, the user selects one level of the plurality of levels. Therefore, in the perspective of the user, one of the levels of the plurality of levels is the default level. Because the user calls the selected level a "default level", it actually does constitute a "default level". Further, Matsui discloses "the receiving terminal requests a video stream corresponding to a video element suited to the default value of the anti-error intensity, among the plural video elements 711-714 described in the SMIL file FSD2, and receives this video stream" ([0248] lines 1-5). Therefore, Matsui teaches sending a response to the received first request from the streaming server to the streaming client, the response including a plurality of error resilience levels supportable by the streaming server in sending the media to the streaming client, wherein the plurality of error resilience levels includes a default error resilience level and an alternative error resilience level.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding claim 10 that Matsui fails to teach, suggest, or disclose "wherein said error resilience value is stored in a file format in which said media is stored", the examiner respectfully disagrees. As indicated in the Final Action, Matsui discloses "SMIL file FSD2 shown in Fig. 5(a) which shows four video data files having different anti-error intensities" ([0231] lines 1-3). Therefore, Matsui teaches the error resilience value being stored in a file format in which the media is stored since the anti-error intensities are shown in the SMIL file.

In response to Applicant's arguments regarding claim 28 that Matsui fails to teach, suggest, or disclose "identifying a media content error resilience level from the media", the examiner respectfully disagrees. As indicated in the Final Action, Matsui discloses "four video data files having different anti-error intensities is employed" ([0231] lines 2-3) and further shows the identification of the anti-error intensities from the media in figs. 5a and 13a. Therefore, Matsui teaches identifying a media content error resilience level from the media.

*Seema S. Rao*  
SEEMA S. RAO 12/20/07  
SUPERNICITY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600